

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

Title of the evaluation:

**EVALUATION OF MEASURES REGARDING PRODUCER ORGANISATIONS
IN THE FRUIT AND VEGETABLE SECTOR**

DG/Unit: DG AGRI, Unit L4

- Official(s) managing the evaluation: Jana Klimova

Evaluator/contractor: Agrosynergie GEIE

Assessment carried out by:

- Steering group with the active participation of DG AGRI units C-2, I-1, L-4 and DG ECFIN.

Date of the Quality Assessment: November 2008

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation covers all evaluation themes and questions. With respect to the geographical and time scope, both have been fully covered. As required by the terms of reference the evaluation analyses the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the producer organisations scheme. Un-intended and dead-weight effects, as well as coherence with the 2nd pillar of the CAP, were also examined. Furthermore, the evaluation takes into account (in particular in the recommendations) the reform of the fruit and vegetable CMO that started to be implemented after the evaluation period.

(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN

Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
SCORING				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The methodology design, which is clearly described, is adequate for the subject of this evaluation. It takes into account the particularities of the intervention scheme, and the incompleteness and incoherence of the official data concerning producer organisations and operational programmes. The appropriate tools for collecting primary data were created and used extensively.

(3) RELIABLE DATA

Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The contractor had access to data provided by the Commission services, based on the official communications of Member States. These data were incomplete and often incoherent. Therefore, the contractor launched an extensive collection of primary data. The following tools were used: survey of producer organisations in nine Member States (95 % of EU producer organisations are located in these nine Member States), case studies in eight regions and Member States, national studies in all (27) Member States. The FADN data were also treated, however, since this database is not designed for the analysis required in this evaluation, the results of the analysis based on FADN have to be considered as only indicative. Data limitations are clearly described and adequately considered.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The analysis is well developed. Due to the extensive data collection carried out by the contractor, some quantitative data could be completed, however, not to a sufficient extent for carrying out a quantitative analysis of all aspects of the intervention scheme. Therefore, the analysis remains in a number of aspects only qualitative. The opinions of stakeholders were considered in a balanced and non-biased way. The limitations of the analysis are clearly presented.

(5) CREDIBLE FINDINGS

Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The findings are based on clearly defined criteria and are supported by the evidence from the analysis. The contextual factors, which are relevant for different regions/Member States and products, are taken into account. Overall, the findings are useful and credible. However, in those cases when they are based only on the results of case studies and/or the survey, they have to be considered with prudence. Such limitations are described in a transparent way.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are substantiated by evaluation findings, they are non-biased and address all evaluation questions. They also take into account the current policy context (after the evaluation period). However, they have to be considered in the context of the limitations of the evaluation (described in the report).

(7) HELPFUL RECOMENDATIONS

Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
		X			

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are clear and impartial. They are potentially useful as they take into account modifications of the policy adopted after the evaluation period. However, they are rather limited with respect to addressing the evaluation findings.

(8) CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
				X	

Arguments for scoring:

The report is well-structured and balanced. Unnecessary repetitions have been avoided and the report is drafted in clear and easily understandable language.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Clearly and fully.

- Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?

The findings and conclusions of the report are reliable, nevertheless, they have to be read in the context of the limitations of the evaluation. These limitations are clearly described and considered in the report.

- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?

The report contains a valuable set of information about the functioning and performance of the producer organisations scheme, including operational programmes and extension of rules.